

No. XXXIII.—THE HABITS OF THE TREE FROG  
(*RHACOPHORUS MACULATUS*).

I watched a little tree frog that twice came on to the table in the verandah in the evenings to make a meal off the insects attracted there by the lamp.

He looked very thin and was very stolid, only moving when something edible came pretty close. The attitude he adopted was comical: folding his "arms" close under him and sitting in a most "collected" posture as if he was going to make a mighty leap. He let all sorts of insects crawl over him only objecting when they stopped too long in his eye; he would then wipe them off lazily with a front leg. He only ate things if still alive. I caught some insects and after incapacitating them put them in front of the frog but he would not pay any attention to them unless they still moved: when he speedily devoured them.

The projection of the tongue is a curious sight: it looks as if half the animal inside was coming out of the huge gape! The tongue is covered with some gummy substance which adhered to the table cloth. He appeared several times to shoot out his tongue and leave this sticky mess on the table when there was nothing there to catch: perhaps he was merely "bird lining" the space in front of him to stop an unwary passer-by. I was anxious to see if he would touch a "geranium bug" (*Cydnus indicus*) and was most surprised to see him take two or three: they must have been very satisfying or did not agree with him as he left soon afterwards jumping off the table on to the vertical back of a chair, a characteristic feat. Perhaps this diet accounts for his thin appearance! I see E. H. A. remarks "their aspect was always famine stricken and angular."

G. O. ALLEN,  
DEHRA DUN.  
19-1-19.

MIRZAPUR, U. P.,  
10th October 1912.

No. XXXIV.—THE HABITS OF *DRYOPHIS MYCTERIZANS*.

The other day I came on a large *Dryophis mycterizans* in the act of swallowing an Earth Snake—a species of *Sylibura*. On my going up close the *Dryophis* disgorged the portion of the *Sylibura* that was down its throat and made off, as did the latter, apparently none the worse for the ordeal! Have any other members of our Society noticed *D. mycterizans* eating other snakes?

A. M. KINLOCH.

KOLLENGODE P. O. via PALGHAT, S. I.  
1st January 1919.

No. XXXV.—THE BITE OF THE LARGE SPOTTED VIPER  
(*LACHESIS MONTICOLA*).

The following may be of interest to you. A boy about twelve years old was brought to me on the 7th instant, and he and father both stated that a snake had just bitten the boy. Their house is quite close, and could not have taken more than 10 minutes for them to come to me, and they declared that they had come at once. I found a puncture on the first finger of the right hand where the boy said he had been bitten, and on squeezing a

little blood showed. I incised the wound well with a Laudor-Brunton lancet and rubbed in Permanganate of Potash Crystals for some minutes with ligature above wrist. The boy only complained of some pain up as far as shoulder, but this may have been the effects of the ligature. He was alright next morning. I sent at once for the snake which they had killed, and it proved to be a *Lachesis monticola*. About 15 inches long, it was under a stone which the boy was removing.

A. WRIGHT,

GYABARI, D. H. RV.,  
10th October 1918.

No. XXXVI.—REMARKS ON COL. WALL'S IDENTIFICATION  
OF *HYDROPHIS CYANOCINCTUS*.

In the last number of this Journal (XXV. 4, p. 754), Col. Wall has given details of some sea snakes—a gravid female and four others—which I sent to the Society's Museum about two years ago. At the time they were identified by me as *H. tuberculatus*, Anderson. Col. Wall now states in his article that he considers them to be *H. cyanocinctus*, a diagnosis with which I cannot agree at all.

It is now nearly six years since I obtained the first specimen of this snake, and being then unable to identify it with any description, sent it to Mr. Boulenger for his opinion.\* He considered it to be *H. tuberculatus*, but as far as I am aware he had no specimen for comparison, the type and only one then known being in the Indian Museum. What is evident, however, is that he did not consider it to be *cyanocinctus*, and this view was confirmed later in a second specimen. (Jnl., Nat. Hist. Soc., Siam., I.4.247). Col. Wall on the other hand who has examined the type of *H. tuberculatus*, has pronounced it to be an undoubted *cyanocinctus* (vide Monograph, p. 220).

I very naturally therefore wished to examine this type for myself, and last year through the kindness of Dr. Annandale I was able to do so. I had no hesitation in agreeing with Col. Wall that it was a *cyanocinctus*. At the same time I felt equally sure that my own snake was not, and being therefore unknown to science I described it under the name of *H. siamensis*.†

I had then a large series of them, together with typical *cyanocinctus*, for comparison, both species being common in the Gulf of Siam. Col. Wall's article is dated December, and at the time he wrote if he could not have seen my description. In any case he could not have known I had renamed the snake, as in my preliminary notice I have given no synonymy.

Col. Wall has given eight reasons to support his diagnosis and I will take them in their order. With Nos. 2, 3 and 5 I agree, but that fact does not in any way influence my decision.

"1. Because the number of the costal rows accords with the range given in Boulenger's description in his Catalogue, Vol. III, p. 295."

I cannot follow Col. Wall in his argument here. The range given by Boulenger is 27 to 33 round the neck, 39 to 45 round the body. Yet the range recorded by Col. Wall for my 13 specimens is, 31 to 35 round the neck, 35 to 39 round the body; 39 in fact, Boulenger's minimum count, is reached only 3 times in the series.

\* This specimen is still in the British Museum of Natural History.

† Preliminary diagnoses of four new sea snakes—Jnl., Nat. Hist. Soc. Siam., II, 4, p. 340, Dec. 1918.